representation by counsel cannot both be exercised at the same time. A party seeking to assert the right of self-representation must clearly and unequivocally discharge any lawyer previously retained. And there's a citation to a bunch of federal court cases there. That's a principle based on federal civil procedure.

Our view is that these Havens entities are all sort of commonly situated. They have a common interest. They have filed common pleadings. They should be treated as a group here.

And we can't have a situation where, you know, we have two different representations, you know, Mr. Havens trying to represent himself and -- I understand for purposes of today, he's saying he's only representing himself, but in papers that he files, he also purports to represent the other entities other than the ones that Mr. Jackson is stating he represents.

And we feel that this is not 1 It is not in compliance with the 2 proper. order that he obtain counsel for his entities. 3 Now, as far as this question about 4 what circumstances he should be 5 under permitted to continue to represent himself, I 6 guess we can address that in a separate 7 pleading, but I just wanted to say that this 8 9 is an untenable situation we're in right now of having now these made-up entities. I think 10 a pleading came in the other day of SkyTel-O 11 and SkyTel-H. And you have to have a road map 12 13 to figure out who is what. And we just have a real problem with that. 14 JUDGE SIPPEL: I understand where 15 you are going on that. And you know what? My 16 answer to that is that at some point, that 17 might become important in this case, but right 18 now I can't stamp out every little brushfire. 19 MR. KELLER: Right. 20 I mean, they are 21 JUDGE SIPPEL: all over the place in this case. 22

1	MR. KELLER: Here's one area where
2	I think maybe
3	MR. HAVENS: May I respond to
4	that?
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: No. What do you
6	have to
7	MR. HAVENS: Very briefly.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Very briefly. I'm
9	sorry.
LO	MR. HAVENS: The Commission in the
L1	hearing designation order identified each of
L2	our LLCs and our nonprofit foundation.
L3	They're distinct. And the Commission has
L4	recognized these entities as distinct because
L5	they are under Delaware Law distinct entities.
L6	And, therefore, I think Mr.
L7	Keller's argument is ostensibly a petition for
L8	reconsideration of the hearing designation
19	order that then identified each entity
20	separately.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: No. That's not
22	true. I mean, that's just inaccurate. It's

accurate that you're telling me what the order 1 I'm sure that the hearing designation 2 savs. says, but that's the 3 order says what it beginning and end of the discussion as far as 4 that's concerned. 5 is here on behalf Counsel 6 Maritime making arguments, making points that 7 he's concerned about, Mr. Keller. 8 just telling him that I'm concerned about some 9 of these things, too, but we're not going to 10 I've got to move on. 11 do it now. So just sit tight with what you 12 Nothing is going to be done without you 13 knowing about it or having your opportunity to 14 say your piece. Nothing is going to be done 15 16 today about any of this. Okay. Black TV in California, you know, 17 that case sounds familiar. 18 MR. PLACHE: Your Honor, 19 familiar with that case. And footnote 16 says 20 "Hybrid representation 21 clearly, retained counsel for the corporation and by an 22

1	individual with identical interests isn't
2	permissible."
3	This is a situation where there is
4	a corporation in the proceeding without
5	counsel and then the individual owner tried to
6	come in and represent himself.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Same scenario?
8	MR. PLACHE: Very similar
9	scenario, yes. There weren't multiple
10	corporations. There was one corporation.
11	It's right on point, I think.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'll take a look at
13	it.
14	MR. HAVENS: These arguments have
15	been made before in Commission proceedings.
16	And the Commission has decided upon virtually
17	identical arguments with regard to the
18	entities in which I am president, I have some
19	interest, but we have other parties and
20	different assets, different business plans,
21	different licenses. They're not all the same.
22	So if time, Your Honor, would

1	permit, I would be glad to take the initiative
2	to address the matter or I can respond to any
3	formal pleadings filed.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: I think you ought
5	to just sit tight and listen okay?
6	MR. PLACHE: I don't think
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: for now, for
8	now.
9	I'm sorry. Sure. Go ahead.
LO	MR. PLACHE: I'd point out also
L1	that was other proceedings he's talking about.
L2	I don't know what they are, but I don't
L3	believe they were ALJ proceedings. I don't
L4	believe they were formal proceedings.
L5	JUDGE SIPPEL: I see what you are
L6	saying. Well
L7	MR. PLACHE: I think they were
L8	license proceedings.
L9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. I understand
20	what you're saying. There is a distinction
21	there because, I mean, this is stuff that the
22	Commission has well, I am satisfied with

the authority I am acting on right now. I will take a look at this case that you're talking about.

MR. KELLER: Your Honor, I think you're probably right that we can't get to the bottom of this whole issue today. And what I will say on that is we will make a separate filing and so that it can be briefed up with the parties and then you can address that.

There is one point on this that I think at least needs to be raised, if not resolved today, because we're going to be discussing about discovery. There is going to be discussion of discovery materials today potentially. And we're still in the midst of discovery.

I've got some issues with Mr. Jackson about the production of documents. And that is this dual representation in separate presentation creates issues under the protective order. And I just still don't know exactly where we stand because while you have

made it very clear in some rulings about documents that are subject to confidentiality, Havens in email like Mr. Havens, Mr. correspondence between myself, the Bureau, and maybe some of the parties -- I don't think anything was formally filed -- had actually taken the position that he or maybe some of his people were entitled to get protective documents as experts, you know.

And that's not in my reading of the protective order. My reading of the protective order is that when it talks about materials being provided to experts, we're talking about people outside the company.

And so I just want to get that clarified and also get some sort of assurance from Mr. Jackson that that is his correct understanding, too, so that any confidential documents that are provided to Mr. Jackson are not being provided to Mr. Havens or people within the entities under the auspices of being experts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Jackson?
2	MR. JACKSON: Yes, Your Honor. I
3	think it would make sense to defer the issue
4	of representation to separate briefing and not
5	belabor this today. I think if you go back to
6	the original 1972 rulemaking, there are some
7	suggestions that the Commission said that in
8	certain instances, individuals, non-attorney
9	individuals, can represent themselves in
10	hearings within the discretion of the hearing
11	officer. But I think there is no sense in
12	briefing that today.
13	In terms of the documents that we
14	have received, we have been following the
15	protective order.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Which means Mr.
17	Havens hasn't gotten?
18	MR. JACKSON: No. I have not sent
19	any discovery to Mr. Havens at this point,
20	Your Honor.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. That
22	answers the question.

1	MR. PLACHE: I need to clarify one
2	thing.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go right ahead.
4	MR. PLACHE: With the discovery
5	for Pinnacle Wireless that was conducted, our
6	responses were served on Mr. Jackson.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: And?
8	MR. PLACHE: And Mr. Keller and
9	Ms. Kane.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I've got a
11	notation written on
12	MR. PLACHE: Not served on Mr.
13	Havens.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: I've got a
15	handwritten notation I don't know; it might
16	have been one of my staff that Mr. Havens
17	is not to see that material.
18	MR. PLACHE: Yes. And we have not
19	served Mr. Havens with that material.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's hope he
21	hasn't seen it.
22	MR. PLACHE: What are the other

1	three companies that are not represented by
2	any counsel?
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: That's the rub.
4	That's the question I ask. Why are they left
5	out there hanging?
6	MR. PLACHE: I don't know.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: But, you know, I
8	don't want to open that can yet.
9	MR. PLACHE: And I'm hopeful that
10	Your Honor is you know, that I am following
11	the appropriate procedures. As I read Your
12	Honor's orders, it seemed that I was to serve
13	counsel.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, you did. As
15	far as I'm
16	MR. PLACHE: Thank you.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: I have no
18	complaints about Pinnacle thus far.
19	MR. PLACHE: Thank you.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: But let me get back
21	to what I'm trying to learn.
22	The Black TV case, I'll check that

Yes, if you want to -- what kind of out. 1 briefing were you suggesting? A motion? 2 MR. KELLER: Well, we'll file some 3 sort of a motion that addresses this issue of 4 dual representation, seeking some sort of 5 And that way the parties will have 6 relief. had an opportunity to respond briefly. 7 JUDGE SIPPEL: Do you think that 8 is a relevant and appropriate issue at this 9 point in this game? Is this going to waste 10 your time or is this important enough? 11 MS. KANE: Personally I think this 12 is just another attempt to delay on behalf of 13 Maritime. We have had a tremendous amount of 14 15 briefing on pertinent issues, like discovery. additional briefing add 16 17 whether or not Mr. Havens is both representing himself and also somehow getting advice from 18 counsel -- I don't even -- it's confusing, 19 frankly, what Maritime is trying to argue. I 20 don't see dual representation here. 21 complied with the 22 We have

protective order in producing information or 1 providing information in public filings to 2 make sure that we're not identifying anything 3 that's confidential to Mr. Havens. We have 4 can't provide him 5 told Mr. Havens we confidential information in accordance with 6 the protective order. 7 I think additional briefing on 8 9 this matter is unnecessary. JUDGE SIPPEL: I'll tell you what. 10 I mean, so much water has gone under the 11 bridge in this case. If you want to write me 12 letter and explain what serious 13 position is, that would be available to be 14 responded to by anyone that cares about it. 15 I mean, I'm not trying to make 16 I am simply saying at this stage 17 light of it. of the case, I just don't think that it's 18 necessary to bring it into the formality of 19 pleadings back and forth and the Bureau. They 20 have a lot of work to do. 21

But I will definitely look at your

1	position and get informed. And anybody who
2	wants to respond to it is certainly free to do
3	so. All right.
4	So it may be a little bit
5	informal, but, on the other hand, it will be
6	on the record. Now
7	MR. PLACHE: Your Honor, can I
8	just
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, sir?
10	MR. PLACHE: Sorry to interrupt.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: No. Go right
12	ahead.
13	MR. PLACHE: I agree that it would
14	be better not to have to spend time on this
15	issue, but could we have an understanding that
16	the filings that show up in our email boxes
17	for Mr. Havens on behalf of himself and all of
18	these companies that are not coming from
19	counsel, that those aren't pertinent to this
20	proceeding and we don't have to spend time and
21	get our client to comb through these files?
22	MS. KANE: Your Honor, I don't

1	think we can agree to that because you have
2	deemed Mr. Havens to be a party in this case
3	pursuant to an order early on. And I think it
4	would be inappropriate to suggest that he
5	shouldn't have the right to be heard, at
6	least, as an individual, as an individual
7	party in this case.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, the
9	designation is what makes him a party. It was
10	done before I
11	MS. KANE: And there have been
1.2	pleadings on that in this case.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, yes. Yes.
14	MS. KANE: If you recall, many of
15	the applicant parties didn't want him to be
16	able to participate. And you ruled that he
17	did have the rights, full rights, of
18	participation of any other party.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Because of what was
20	in the hearing designation.
21	MS. KANE: Correct, Your Honor.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're correct.

You're correct on what my rulings were. And I will abide by those rulings until something shows me otherwise.

But I'm not going to cut Mr. Keller off from making an argument which is pertinent to the case and which is somewhat complicated. I'd rather he do it in a letter so that it doesn't become framed as an issue. Anybody who wants can read the letter and respond to it if they care to. So you don't have worry about taking your time if you don't want to.

I'm not going to issue any relief based on a letter. That is something they do at the Second Circuit all the time. But we are rolling.

We are back to where we have a stipulation -- I mean, I know there are a lot of discovery issues floating around, but there are two very specific issues if you wanted to raise them. One was stipulations. The other was a report on the bankruptcy.

Why don't we start with the report 1 on the bankruptcy? 2 MR. KELLER: I almost hesitate to 3 say this, but I have on other point on this 4 matter, really, the matter of Havens. 5 reason I feel that I need to bring it up here 6 7 is because --JUDGE SIPPEL: Go right ahead. 8 MR. KELLER: -- you know, I have 9 10 received correspondence from Mr. Jackson. This has to do with the disk, the disk copy 11 12 that was produced to the Commission, produced 13 to the Bureau pursuant to your order. In your order dated February 7th, 14 2012, -- it's FCC number 12M-8 -- it was 15 16 directed that a copy of the disk would also be provided to Mr. Havens if we could contribute 17 one-half of Maritime's printing costs or, 18 alternatively, the original documents would be 19 20 made available for his inspection. We're prepared to comply with that 21 part of the order, but I recently, in the last 22

couple of weeks, got a letter from Mr. Jackson 1 saying that they wanted us to turn the disk 2 over or, else, suffer sanctions and that sort 3 of thing. 4 5 And I responded to him, pointing him at this order, saying we would be happy to 6 comply with the terms of that order: either 7 pay half the costs, as the order directs; or 8 9 make arrangements to come and see the originals. 10 And I am not even asking for a 11 12 ruling from you. I just want it to be on the 13 record that we've taken that position so that if anything does come in saying that 14 haven't complied or keeping sanctions from --15 sir, 16 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, Jackson? 17 MR. JACKSON: Your Honor, just a 18 very brief response to that. We believe that 19 equal party in this matter, that 20 effectively Maritime has waived its right to 21

seek -- by giving the CD to the Bureau, we

believe that Maritime has waived its right to collect the amount. And we believe that a CD is appropriate.

Alternatively, we believe that under section 556 of the APA -- and, again, I am not going to argue this here today. I just want to note it for you -- that we're entitled to the record from the staff. Staff disagrees and points to rule 1.325 that that is a potential dispute.

Your Honor, if the copying fees stand, we believe the principle should be extended to all documents for all parties.

And that will become of some interest when I talk of the hundreds of boxes of documents later, Your Honor.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, Mr. Havens is already familiar as we go into this case as a party. And I'm not clear of all of that particular ruling in light of the fact that his pre-hearing participation was to bring certain facts to light, as I understand it.

Whether the facts were accurate or not I have 1 no idea, but, in any event, there has been 2 justification that he would be a party in this 3 4 case. Now, as a party, as a party, he is 5 going to be subject to my orders. And I've 6 got a lot of discretion. I don't want to 7 charge the Bureau because they work for the 8 9 government. They don't have any money. I think Mr. Havens can afford the 10 He's doing it. I mean, cost of business. 11 there is so much going on in Mr. Havens' world 12 it's hard to believe that this is a money 13 14 problem. As a matter of principle, that's 15 16 where my discretion comes in. And if you want to make a showing of -- you know, he wants to 17 proceed in cooperates or something like that, 18 but I don't believe you are going to be able 19 That's my ruling. I mean, for 20 to make it.

If he wants the documents, they're

better or for worse, that's it.

21

1	right there to get. It's going to cost him a
2	couple of bucks. And let's get on with it.
3	If there's a principle involved
4	here, I don't see it as being an overriding
5	principle. Treat parties fairly. Yes.
6	That's a good start for a good principle.
7	Substantially everybody is being
8	treated fairly. You know, we take care of
9	widows. We don't take care of rich guys. I
10	think the comparison is not accurate, but I am
11	trying to make my point.
12	I do have a discretion in terms of
13	how I am going to treat parties as long as I
14	am not abusing the discussion. I don't think
15	I have. Anybody want to charge me with abuse
16	of discretion? Is that what you would be
17	doing?
18	MR. JACKSON: I'm not here
19	arguing, Your Honor. I just want to set out
20	what the argument was, the dispute.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: But if you really
22	don't like what I have done as far as our

1	lawyers are concerned, you know, there are
2	only a couple of lawyers
3	MR. JACKSON: Right.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: you can
5	approach. And it's got to be in your mind
6	let me just leave it like that, that that's my
7	ruling for today.
8	MR. JACKSON: Thank you, Your
9	Honor.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: You bet. Let's go
11	back now to this report on are we okay?
12	Are we all set now?
13	MR. KELLER: No. I have more to
14	say on this issue, but very well-said. I'll
15	put it in my letter.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you. Thank
17	you.
18	MR. HAVENS: Your Honor, I will
19	separately address that. We are bringing up
20	matters today which Mr. Keller, Mr. Jackson
21	and myself, Ms. Kane agreed would not be a
22	topic today. All the discussion thus far has

www.nealrgross.com

1 been on things we agreed were not a topic today under your order. 2 In any case, in terms of the CD, I 3 will address that separately. Ostensibly I 4 5 disagree, but I don't want to take further I understand your order. 6 JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. That's the 7 only thing I care about right now. I mean, I 8 9 respect your judgment. I respect what you are saying. But I don't want to get any further 10 into it today. We have got other business to 11 12 accomplish hopefully. 13 So let's get back to the What is the status of 14 bankruptcy. 15 bankruptcy? Okay. The status of 16 MR. KELLER: 17 the bankruptcy is that on April the 30th, a plan of reorganization was filed. The plan of 18 reorganization provides that the assets of the 19 company, which the purpose is here that 20 basically the license assets -- all the 21

licenses will be assigned to an entity called

Choctaw Communications or something like that. 1 I don't have the exact name handy. Choctaw. 2 Choctaw, C-h-o-c-t-a-w. Ι 3 What is it? believe it is Choctaw Communications. 4 This is an entity owned by certain 5 of the secured creditors in the bankruptcy. 6 They are separately represented. They have 7 separate FCC counsel, et cetera. 8 The terms of the -- in general 9 outline, the terms are that they sort of 10 swapped out their claims against the estate in 11 exchange for these assets and an undertaking 12 to make good on the other claims against the 13 estate based on the sale of those assets. 14 They intend to honor the existing 15 16 contracts that are already outstanding, some of which are designated in this proceeding. 17 Depriests, the 18 furthermore, And, Depriest and her husband, have no interest in 19 company, will the receive none of 20 this proceeds, and will also be foregoing 21

claims they have against the estate.

1	I believe they have claims to the
2	tune of, direct and indirect, upwards of \$7
3	million, but they will not be receiving those.
4	So they will receive no
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Not that won't be
6	receiving. He's going to drop the claim.
7	MR. KELLER: I don't know the
8	formal terminology, but yes, they're either
9	I don't know whether they'll be waiving the
10	claims, but they're not going to receive the
11	money. That's the bottom line.
12	MR. HAVENS: This is not a topic
13	of today's discussion. I would have had
14	bankruptcy counsel attend the hearing today if
15	this was to be a topic.
16	MR. KELLER: This is just a report
17	on the status.
18	MR. HAVENS: Yes, I understand.
19	TT TT (1) in the second of boards
	Your Honor, this was not a topic.
20	MR. KELLER: So that
20	